UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

HILLARY LAWSON, et al., \* Case No. 17-CV-6404(BMC)

\* Brooklyn, New York
\* October 17, 2018 Plaintiffs,

HOWARD RUBIN, et al.,

Defendants.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN M. GOLD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

v.

For the Plaintiff: BRIAN L. GROSSMAN, ESQ.

> Balestriere Fariello 225 Broadway, Suite 2900

New York, NY 10007

BENJAMIN ROSENBERG, ESO. For the Defendant,

Howard Rubin: Dechert LLP

1095 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

Powers:

For Defendant Jennifer DOUGLAS E. GROVER, ESQ. JOLENE LAVIGNE-ALBERT, ESQ. Schlam Stone & Dolan LLP 26 Broadway, 19th Floor

New York, NY 10004

For Defendant Aloi, Pro Se: MR. ROBERT ALOI

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

```
2
 1
             (Proceedings commenced at 10:04 a.m.)
                  THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. This is Judge
 2
 3
        Gold, and I hope I'm speaking to everyone involved in Lawson
        v. Rubin, 17-CV-6404.
 4
                  I'd like to get an appearance for plaintiffs,
 5
 6
        please.
 7
                  MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning, Judge Gold. My name is
 8
        Brian Grossman, at Balestriere Fariello, for plaintiffs.
 9
                  THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Grossman. An appearance
10
        for Rubin, please?
11
                  MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, this is Benjamin
12
        Rosenberg from Dechert. And with me is my colleague, Benjamin
13
        Rose.
14
                  THE COURT: Thank you. I'm just going through the
15
        docket getting acquainted with everybody, so bear with me
16
        please.
17
                  An appearance for Powers?
18
                  MR. GROVER: Your Honor, this is Douglas Grover, at
19
        Schlam Stone & Dolan, and I believe my colleague, Jolene
20
        Lavigne-Albert is on the phone as well.
2.1
                  THE COURT: Is there any confirmation of that belief
22
        by Ms. Lavigne-Albert?
                  MS. LAVIGNE-ALBERT: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.
23
24
                  THE COURT: Good morning. Am I correct that
25
        defendant Schnur is no longer in the case, Mr. Grossman?
```

```
3
 1
                  MS. LAVIGNE-ALBERT: Correct.
 2
                  MR. GROSSMAN: That is correct, Your Honor, although
 3
        she -- Ms. Schnur is counsel, but not of record, and not
        appearing in this case for Mr. Rubin, and also Ms. Powers, and
 4
        I believe she is on the phone.
 5
                  MS. SCHNUR: Yes, I'm on the phone. Good morning,
 6
        Your Honor.
 7
 8
                  THE COURT: Hello, Ms. Schnur. I don't --
                  MS. SCHNUR: Hi. Good morning.
 9
                  THE COURT: I mean, I quess if nobody objects you're
10
11
        welcome to remain, but I don't understand you to be either a
12
        party or counsel of record at this point. Is that correct?
13
                  MS. SCHNUR: I've been, I've been counsel of record.
14
        I haven't entered a notice of appearance.
15
                  THE COURT: Well, I think that's what we generally
16
        mean by counsel of record, that is someone who's entered a
17
        notice of appearance. But if there's no objection, I'm happy
18
        to have you on the line.
19
                  I take it Ms. Shon is also terminated as a
20
        plaintiff, correct?
2.1
                  MR. GROSSMAN: That is correct, from plaintiffs,
22
        Your Honor.
23
                  THE COURT: And Defendant Blue Icarus, LLC is no
24
        longer a defendant, correct?
25
                  MR. GROSSMAN: That is correct as well.
```

```
4
 1
                  THE COURT: All right.
 2
                  MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.
 3
                  THE COURT: Now --
                  MR. ROSENBERG: Judge Gold, one clarification, Shon
 4
        is a defendant who is no longer a defendant.
 5
                  THE COURT: Shon is a defendant who is no longer a
 6
 7
        defendant. That --
 8
                  MR. GROSSMAN: Her case was dismissed.
 9
                  THE COURT: Yeah, that's what I tried to say, but
10
        maybe it didn't come out clearly. Okay.
11
                  The sole matter referred to me by Judge Cogan,
12
        concerns a motion to quash filed by non-party Robert Aloi.
                                                                     Is
13
        Mr. Aloi on the phone?
14
                  MR. ALOI: Good morning, Your Honor. I am on the
15
        phone.
16
                  THE COURT: Good. And you are representing yourself
17
        in this connection?
18
                  MR. ALOI: Yes, Your Honor.
19
                  THE COURT: Let me ask you a few questions, Mr.
20
        Aloi.
2.1
                  In your submission to the Court, you make reference
22
        in paragraph 2 of an ongoing criminal matter in the State of
23
        New Jersey.
24
                  I do not intend to ask you any substantive questions
        about that matter, but I am interested in knowing the
25
```

```
5
 1
        following. Are you represented by an attorney in connection
 2
        with that matter?
 3
                  MR. ALOI: Yes.
                  THE COURT: Is that attorney retained or court
 4
 5
        appointed?
                  MR. ALOI: Retained.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Is there any reason then why that
 8
        retained attorney is not assisting you in connection with this
 9
        application?
                  MR. ALOI: He stated it was a different matter and
10
11
        that he was not able to work with me in the State of New York.
12
                  THE COURT: I see.
13
                  MR. ALOI: He referred me to an attorney which
14
        wanted large fees as a retainer, which I cannot afford.
15
                  THE COURT: Thank you for the clarification.
16
                  I'm going to ask you one more question about the
17
        case. I see a complaint number and a police case number.
18
                  I'm not familiar enough with the way entries are
19
        made in the records of the New Jersey state courts to know
20
        what stage of the case this has proceeded to. Are you under
2.1
        indictment there? Have you been arrested?
22
                  Can you, without talking about the substance of the
23
        case, are you able to say anything about its status?
24
                  MR. ALOI: All of the above at this moment, Your
25
        Honor. We filed a motion to dismiss. That motion to dismiss
```

```
6
 1
        was granted. The State of New Jersey has filed an appeal and
 2
        we are waiting for their appeal briefs.
 3
                  THE COURT: Thank you.
                  MR. ALOI: Which they just asked for a 30-day
 4
        extension.
 5
                  THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Aloi.
 6
                  What I have read is the August 30th submission from
 7
 8
        Mr. Aloi, and the September 11th filing by Mr. Rubin. Have
        any other papers -- you know, the docket sheet has many
 9
10
        entries on it.
11
                  Has anyone submitted anything other than those two
12
        sets of documents to the Court?
13
                  MR. GROSSMAN: This is Brian Grossman for plaintiff.
14
        We have not submitted anything. We do not oppose, but we also
15
        do not consent.
16
                  THE COURT: Thank you.
17
                  MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, this is Benjamin
18
        Rosenberg for Defendant Rubin.
19
                  There has been another submission which was a
20
        subsequent submission by Mr. Aloi, Document No. 175, which is
2.1
        dated -- filed September 17th, 2018.
22
                  THE COURT: Thank you. I --
23
                  MR. ROSENBERG: It's an answer to our opposition.
24
                  THE COURT: I see that, and I'm opening it right
              Thank you for bringing it to my attention. I have not
25
        now.
```

```
7
 1
        seen it before.
 2
                  MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: I'm going to ask --
                  MS. LAVIGNE-ALBERT: Your Honor, this is --
 4
                  THE COURT: Go ahead.
 5
                  MS. LAVIGNE-ALBERT: This is Jolene Lavigne-Albert
 6
 7
        for Defendant Powers. We have not filed any papers. However
        we adjoin in Dechert's submission for Defendant Rubin.
 8
                  THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
 9
             (Pause.)
10
11
                  THE COURT: Just bear with me while I take a look at
12
        these papers. Oh, I see now that they're mostly exhibits.
13
        All right.
14
                  So it seems to me that there are three issues, only
15
        one of which is serious, but it's quite serious, by which I
16
        mean number one, Mr. Aloi objects on the grounds that he
17
        wasn't given sufficient time.
18
                  Mr. Rubin responds, that's not a problem, we'll give
19
        Mr. Aloi any reasonable extension of time he needs. So that
20
        takes care of that issue.
2.1
                  Number two, there's some reference by Mr. Aloi to
22
        perhaps wanting to bring his own civil action. Mr. Rubin
23
        says, well, that would waive any Fifth Amendment privilege if
24
        he did.
                That may well be correct, but Mr. Aloi has not yet
```

filed such an action so I don't think his speculation about

25

what he might or might not do in the future is sufficient grounds to vitiate a claim of Fifth Amendment privilege.

That brings us to the most serious issue, which is the Fifth Amendment invocation by Mr. Aloi, who has identified a specific pending criminal case, which if on appeal I take it is a matter of public record and accessible to counsel.

I've reviewed the subpoena that Mr. Rubin seeks to enforce, and I am directing my attention right now to Docket Entry 173-1, and the list of five documents to be produced.

These are not documents that would fall within the foregone conclusion exception recognized to active production incrimination.

These are doc -- these are broad demands, and it would seem that were I to enforce them, it would be the kind of incriminatory communication that concerned the Court in the cases that, although I had some familiarity with beforehand, I must acknowledge Mr. Rubin very helpfully and candidly put before the Court, United States against Hubbell, 530 US 27, and United States against Greenfield, 831 F.3d 106, of course, going back to such seminal cases as Fisher, from the 1970s.

In *Hubbell*, in particular, I recall the language —
if I can find it again. The collection — the language at
page 41 of the opinion, about how collecting and producing the
materials demanded would be tantamount to answering a series
of interrogatories and asking the witness to disclose the

2.1

existence and location of particular documents fitting broad descriptions.

The assembly of literally hundreds of pages of material in response to a request, which I won't quote, is the functional equivalent of the preparation of an answer to a written interrogatory or a series of oral questions at a discovery deposition.

So I'm really uncertain, Mr. Gross -- Mr. Rosenberg, how one would distinguish Mr. Aloi's predicament from the ones that face Mr. Greenfield or Mr. Hubbell in these two cases, and of course there's nobody at this table in a position to grant Mr. Aloi active production immunity.

And his Fifth Amendment concerns seem hardly to be speculative, at least assuming as I do, absent any indication to the contrary, that the New Jersey proceeding overlaps somewhat with the issues raised in this case.

MR. ROSENBERG: Your Honor, if I may? This is Benjamin Rosenberg.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. ROSENBERG: I understand the concern, and of course that's why we addressed that and cited the *Hubblell* case, which — but I believe that this is distinguishable from *Hubbell*, because this request documents many of which — the existence of which are a foregone conclusion, because it is established through the record in our case, and I don't

2.1

believe that Mr. Aloi disputes it, that he had communications with the plaintiffs about Mr. Rubin and about this case.

So the foregone conclusion as to the existence of those document is satisfied.

Now, it is also -- well, as to documents concerning his -- forgive me. So that's number one. All documents reflect communications with plaintiffs. Similarly it's established that there are documents reflecting communications or communications with the defendants.

I suppose I should be more precise. It may be not be the case that documents that reflect the communications, that is in which he may refer to them. There may not be the foregone conclusion as to those.

But as to any communications that he had with defendants, those I believe, are a foregone -- the existence of those is a foregone conclusion.

THE COURT: Well, I'm --

MR. ROSENBERG: Similarly, it's established --

THE COURT: So --

MR. ROSENBERG: Forgive me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, no, please proceed. I thought -your pause led me to think you were finished, but I was
mistaken. So please, continue.

MR. ROSENBERG: Of course, Your Honor.

To the extent that there are documents that reflect

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the criminal case, or that are public documents in the criminal case, I believe those are responsive to the third request, although I would acknowledge that those are generally not as important then we can get those from the public record.

But I think I will -- as to, I do not recall, Your Honor, off-hand, whether we have evidence already of documents reflecting communications between Mr. Aloi and Mr. Balestriere, who is along with Mr. Grossman, counsel to the plaintiffs. But we do have evidence and it's established there were communications between Mr. Aloi and Mr. Salin. So once again, those documents or communications,

the existence thereof, is a foregone conclusion.

I think that distinguishes the case from Hubbell, which -- and I'd submit that this, precisely because our document request is much narrower than the one at issue in that case, and goes to matters -- the existence of which is known to us, although the content is not. But the content, of course, is not protected by the Fifth Amendment. Thank you.

MS. SCHNUR: Your Honor, this is Yifat Schnur. Just to add to that, we do know of a communication between Mr. Aloi and Mr. John Balestriere.

THE COURT: Well, I would imagine you would since Mr. Balestriere is counsel to the parties -- to one of the parties in the case. I mean, I understand that argument, but I think I'm either confused or we have a different

2.1

understanding of the foregone conclusion test that maybe you can brief further for me if you're pressing the point.

By which I mean, to say that it's a foregone conclusion because you know generally that Mr. Aloi had communications with the plaintiffs about the defendants, and I don't know how you know that, by the way, from your submission, but assume that you — except for the one exhibit that's attached.

But assume -- let's assume you could establish that.

My understanding of the "foregone conclusion exception" is,

A., that it applies on a document-specific basis, not a

subject matter basis.

So for example, if the prosecution in *Hubbell* knew that it was a foregone conclusion that Mr. Hubbell conducted financial transactions in the course of his life because they knew he had a credit card, and they knew he received payroll checks from his law firm, would that mean that it was a foregone conclusion such that he would have no Fifth Amendment protection in all of his work papers, and financial statements and, other financial documents that he prepared because it's a foregone conclusion that he had income and expenses?

I don't think so. And that's really all you're telling me. You're not telling me that it's a foregone conclusion that on such and such a date at such and such a time, from telephone number A, Mr. Aloi sent a text message

about Mr. Rubin to plaintiff X.

2.1

And I think it's that kind of foregone conclusion that the courts are saying might create a narrow exception to the right to invoke the Fifth Amendment.

My second concern is that Mr. Aloi's difficulty is with the fact that he's being prosecuted by the authorities in New Jersey.

And I don't know that even if, based upon your investigation, Mr. Rosenberg, and information you've developed from your client, Mr. Rosenberg, that the New Jersey prosecutors are aware as a foregone conclusion of all of these communications that you might be able to establish with more detailed submissions, you have a foregone conclusion about.

And I'm wondering whether the case law speaks to whose foregone conclusion is at issue. But it seems to me logical to think that if the New Jersey prosecutors don't share the foregone conclusions that you seem to have reached, whether Mr. Aloi's Fifth Amendment rights are still enforceable or assertible, if I can make up a word there.

MR. ROSENBERG: But, Your Honor -- oh, forgive me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, I was going to invite you to respond, Mr. Rosenberg, if you'd like to.

MR. ROSENBERG: If I may, Your Honor? As to the -I do not know -- I cannot, as I sit here, Your Honor, cite

authority on precisely the questions, and I would appreciate the opportunity to address them, to research them and address them briefly to the Court in a letter or a submission.

THE COURT: Of course.

2.1

MR. ROSENBERG: However, as to the -- thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As to the second matter, it seems to me that it's not the New Jersey prosecutor's understanding that matters.

It must be the party that subpoenas the material because otherwise anyone could say, well, there could be a prosecutor somewhere who doesn't -- as to whom this is not a foregone conclusion. So even if it is as to you, I can avoid producing.

THE COURT: Well, I understand the words you've said, but I'm not sure I agree because it's one thing for a person invoking the Fifth Amendment to say there might be some prosecutor somewhere else who doesn't share this foregone conclusion.

It's another thing to say, I am in the midst of criminal litigation with a prosecuting authority that doesn't have the same access to detailed information that Mr. Rubin does.

And my disclosure in this case can then be accessed by that prosecutor in furtherance of an ongoing criminal

2.1

litigation. That is a far less speculative and more concrete Fifth Amendment concern than the one you hypothesized.

And I really don't understand how to -- how I can require Mr. Aloi to turn over documents to you, that then can be reached by a prosecutor who is in the middle of trying to indict him.

And, you know, one of the background facts that I haven't made explicit on this record, but that my reading of the pleadings seems to indicate, is that whether the plaintiff's alleged version of the facts is accurate, or Mr. Rubin's is, there is plenty of reason to believe that if Mr. Aloi had the kinds of communications that would be responsive to your subpoena, they would be incriminating in either case.

And so it is a very concrete and specific invocation of the Fifth Amendment, not a speculative, well maybe there is some prosecutor somewhere who doesn't know enough to have a foregone conclusion.

So I am going to grant the motion to quash without prejudice to a motion to reconsider that addresses the case law questions I've raised during the argument today, which you can submit at any point you think you have enough to persuade me otherwise, Mr. Rosenberg.

MR. ROSENBERG: Very well, Your Honor. We will do research and if appropriate, file a motion too.

THE COURT: Does anybody want to add anything to

2.1

today's record, Mr. Grossman? I only wrote down last names.

I may have forgotten genders. I apologize if I misattribute
anyone's gender here. Mr. Grossman?

THE COURT: And, Mr. Rosenberg, I think you and I have wrapped up, but if you'd like to add anything I want to give you the opportunity.

MR. GROSSMAN: Nothing from plaintiff, Your Honor.

MR. ROSENBERG: No, Your Honor. I appreciate that. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Grover or Ms. Lavigne-Albert?

MR. GROVER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Aloi, did you understand and follow everything that we talked about today?

MR. ALOI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Aloi, you seem like a very articulate person, but if you're not trained in the law, and Mr. Rosenberg does, in fact, renew his application with new legal authorities, the questions that that renewed application will raise, I think will be somewhat technical legal questions.

And I'm not in a position to evaluate your financial wherewithal, or whether your attorney in New Jersey can be admitted pro hoc vice, which means even though he's not a member of the New York Bar, could be admitted for the limited purposes of representing you in connection with the motion,

```
1
        but I would urge you to explore all possibilities to obtain
        legal assistance if, in fact, Mr. Rubin renews the motion.
 2
 3
                  One other thing I want to say --
                  MR. ALOI: I understand, Your Honor.
 4
                  THE COURT: -- Mr. Aloi, I am assuming that you're
 5
        making this Fifth Amendment invocation in good faith.
 6
 7
                  That means that I'm assuming that you have no
 8
        intention of providing documents or testimony on behalf of the
        plaintiffs either.
 9
10
                  You cannot invoke your Fifth Amendment privilege
11
        with respect to Mr. Rubin's requests for information or
12
        assistance, and decline to invoke it if the plaintiffs request
13
        information or assistance. There's no cherry picking here.
14
        It's one way or the other. So I want to be clear about that.
15
                  And should it develop that you've provided
16
        documents, or testimony, or affidavits, or information about
17
        this to the plaintiffs, that will be a basis for Mr. Rosenberg
18
        to renew his motion with a quite compelling argument.
19
                  Do you follow?
20
                  MR. ALOI: Oh, I definitely understand, Your Honor.
2.1
                  THE COURT: Okay, good. All right. Have a good
22
        day, everybody.
23
                  MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. You as well.
24
                  MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
                  MR. ALOI: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Good bye. (Proceedings concluded at 10:28 a.m.) I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber and certified electronic reporter and transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the aboveentitled matter. Christine Fiere October 24, 2018 Christine Fiore, CERT